REMARKS

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Terita (4,681,392).

Applicant respectively traverses the rejections about the claims 1-6 due to the following reasons.

In regard to claim 1:

Claim 1 calls for a compliant section 12 comprising at least one rib 123 and a pair of beams 120,121. Each of the beams is longitudinal extending piece having two opposed ends connecting to the rib 123. While, the wing 24, which is rolled upward from a flat flank 23 as described by Terita in column 4, line 8-10 and in FIGS. 1, 5-8, is discrete from the web 22 at two opposed ends 27 of the wing 24. Thus it appears that Terita disclosed the pair of wings 24 other than the pair of beams as otherwise called for in claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art and should be allowed.

In regard to claims 2-6:

Claims 2-6 should be allowable since they are dependent from claim 1, directly or indirectly.

Claim 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terita.

Applicant respectively traverses the rejections about claims 7-8 due to

PAGE 6/9 * RCVD AT 8/16/2005 12:45:29 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:408 919 8353 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-16

the following reasons.

In regard to claim 7:

A stamped contact part for use within an electrical connector defined in claim 7 comprises a compliant section 12 defining a longitudinal direction 126 and including a pair of **slots 122** spaced by a rib 123 and **extending along said longitudinal direction and through said compliant sections 12 in a thickness direction of said compliant section 12 which is perpendicular to said longitudinal direction 126,** each of said slots 122 being located between said rib 123 and **one corresponding outer arc-like beam 121** in a transverse direction which is perpendicular to both said longitudinal direction 126 and said thickness direction; wherein a dimension of said rib 123 along said thickness is larger than that of said arc-like beam 120,121 along said thickness direction.

Terita discloses an epsilon-shaped cross-section compliant pin 20 for use within an electrical connector, comprising a rolled portion 29 defining a longitudinal direction. The rolled portion 29 includes a pair of slots extending along the longitudinal direction and spaced by a web 22. **Anyhow, the slots are sealed by a root portion of a curved wing 24 extending from the web 22 at one end in a thickness direction of the rolled portion 29 which is perpendicular to said longitudinal direction (FIGS. 1, 6-8),** each of the slots being located between the web 22 and a curved wing 24 in a transverse direction which is perpendicular to both said longitudinal direction and said thickness direction. **A dimension of the web 22 along said thickness is smaller than that of the curved wings 24 along the thickness direction (FIG. 8).**

It should be understood in claim 7 that the outer arc-like beams 120,121 span the whole length of the slots 122 and the slots 122 extends

PAGE 7/9 * RCVD AT 8/16/2005 12:45:29 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:408 919 8353 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-16

through said compliant sections 12 in a thickness direction of said compliant section 12 which is perpendicular to the longitudinal direction 126, so there is no support along the length of the slots 122, which provides more compliance to the compliant sections 12. However, from what Terita disclosed at column 4, row 7-19 or FIG 1, 5-8, it can be seen that the curved wings 24 extend from the central web 22 are supported by the web 22 at the sealed end all along the length of the slots. It is clear that the curved wings 24 are less flexible and unsymmetrical along the thickness direction of the rolled portion 29, so that a biased force would be applied to the compliant pin 20 when the rolled portion 29 is inserted into a through hole defined in a PCB. Based on the differences described above, applicant considers that the description and drawings of Terita do not teach one skilled in the art that the compliant section have a rib and a pair of arc-like beam with a pair of slot extending through the depth of the compliant section.

Therefore, applicants now believe that claim 7 should be patentable over the cited prior art.

In regard to claim 8:

Claim 8 should be allowable since they are dependent from claim 7, indirectly.

In regard to claims 9 and 10:

Claim 9 defines the specific cross-section of the rib and that of the beam which are not shown in the cited references. Thus, claims 9 and 10 are allowable.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Hu, Snower

PAGE 8/9 * RCVD AT 8/16/2005 12:45:29 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:408 919 8353 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-16

By _____
Wei-Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137

PAGE 9/9 * RCVD AT 8/16/2005 12:45:29 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:408 919 8353 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-16 P.09